

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

March 14, 1986 3:28 AM

WORKING DRAFT

INTERAGENCY GROUP ON SPACE

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR

THE U.S. SPACE LAUNCH PROGRAM

March 25, 1986

CLASSIFIED BY: DoD/DUSD(P)

DECLASSIFY on OADR

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Rev. K 03 14

CONFIDENTIAL**FOREWORD**

This draft report has been prepared in response to the directives received from the National Security Council Interagency Group (Space) per memorandum dated February 7th 1986, Rodney B. McDaniel to Donald P. Gregg and al., subject: IG (Space) Actions. It has been coordinated with the following:

Otho Eskin _____ Department of State

Robert H. Brumley / Courtney Stadd Department of Commerce

M. Johnson _____ Department of Transportation

D. Taft / J. Struthers _____ Office of Management and Budget

_____ Intelligence Community Staff

25X1

T. J. Bishop/ M.L. Hunter _____ Department of Defense (OJCS)

L. Nosenzo/ V. Teplitz _____ Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

M. Roesch _____ Office of Science and Technology

C. O. Forsythe _____ National Aeronautics and Space
Administration

(Co-Chairman)

T.P. Rona / T.E. Maulsby _____ Department of Defense (OSD/USAF)
(Co-Chairman)

CONFIDENTIAL

Rev K 03-14

CONFIDENTIAL

SECURITY NOTICE

Pending determination of the classification level of this report, it should be handled as **CONFIDENTIAL**. It will be distributed only to government personnel with established need to know in support of the Working Group.

COORDINATION STATUS

This working draft (Revision K) contains material not coordinated within the originating agencies. It has not been approved or endorsed by the Working Group of the Interagency Group (Space).

CONFIDENTIAL

Rev. K 03-14

Line Count

OUTLINE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

II. BACKGROUND

III. IMPACTS ON THE U.S. SPACE ACTIVITIES

IV. NEAR-TERM ACTIONS

IV. RECOVERY STRATEGIES

1. INTRODUCTION
2. OBJECTIVES
3. CRITERIA AND RATIONALE FOR SELECTION
4. STRATEGY ALTERNATIVES
5. DISCUSSION
6. SUMMARY TABLES (DESCRIPTION, MERITS, FUNDING)

V. POLICY ISSUES

VI. AREAS OF MAJOR CONCERN

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

APPENDIX A Mission Models

APPENDIX B Currently Planned STS Manifests

CONFIDENTIAL

Rev. K 03-14

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| INDEX | |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 1 |
| I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE | 4 |
| II. BACKGROUND | 7 |
| III. IMPACTS ON THE U.S. SPACE ACTIVITIES | XX |
| IV. NEAR-TERM ACTIONS | XX |
| IV. RECOVERY STRATEGIES | XX |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | XX |
| 2. OBJECTIVES | XX |
| 3. CRITERIA AND RATIONALE FOR SELECTION | XX |
| 4. STRATEGY ALTERNATIVES | XX |
| 5. DISCUSSION | XX |
| 6. SUMMARY TABLES (DESCRIPTION, MERITS, FUNDING) | XX |
| V. POLICY ISSUES | XX |
| VI. AREAS OF MAJOR CONCERN | XX |
| VII. RECOMMENDATIONS | XX |
| APPENDIX A Mission Models | XX |
| APPENDIX B Currently Planned STS Manifests | XX |

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Rev. K 03 14

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(To be Supplied)

Rosen

CONFIDENTIAL

Rev. K 03-14

.....

01
02
03
04
05
06
07
08
09
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

CONFIDENTIAL

Rev. K 03-14

CONFIDENTIAL

■
■
■
■
■
■
■

01
02
03
04
05
06
07
08
09
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

CONFIDENTIAL

Rev. K 03-14

CONFIDENTIAL

March 14, 1986 4:55 AM

I. INTRODUCTION

In January 1986 the 25th Shuttle launch (Mission 51L) suffered a failure that resulted in the destruction of the orbiter CHALLENGER and the loss of its crew. The President ordered the establishment of an independent Presidential Commission (Executive Order _____), known as the "Rogers Commission", after its Chairman, Secretary William P. Rogers, to establish the causes of the accident and to recommend corrective actions by June 1986. The Intergaency Group responsible for this report was separately charged with assessing the impact on the nations' launch capability, and the impact of delaying the deployment of satellites scheduled before the accident, and with identifying the appropriate recovery options. The report of the IG(Space) Group was requested on an accelerated basis in order to preserve the President's option of submitting an FY 86 supplemental budget request in support of the implementation of recovery actions. Some have argued that the recovery/reconstitution actions (specifically those related to the procurement of a replacement orbiter) should await the conclusions of the Rogers Commission for both political and programmatic reasons. The IG(Space) believes, however, that the replacement orbiter will not be affected by the Rogers Commission's recommendations in regard to remedial actions in respect to other appts of the STS. Thus far, the Commission's inquiry has not implicated the CHALLENGER itself in the causes of the accident. Should the Commission's work result in the need for modification in the replacement orbiter, this will be known in ample time to be incorporated in the orbiter's normal production cycle.

New Text from
ICS**CONFIDENTIAL**

Rev K 03-14

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

01
02 This Interagency Group (Space) report responds to the National Security
03 Council directive dated February 7, 1986 on the subject of recovery from the
04 accidental loss of the STS orbiter CHALLENGER on January 28, 1986.

Adapted from
Chapter I of
Revision GA of
Resource
Document

05
06 Three specific objectives have been set forth for the study reported here.
07 First, consider, and report on, the possible impacts on the nation's space launch
08 capabilities to implement the national space policies. Second, summarize the
09 recommendations made by the cognizant agencies on the ways to mitigate the
10 immediate impact of the CHALLENGER accident on the on-going three sectors of
11 the U.S. space activities: national security, civil, and commercial. Third, develop
12 and assess the measures to be taken for reconstituting the U.S. means for
13 providing assured access to space in order to accommodate the President's broad
14 space policy objectives. The Group was encouraged to identify any longer-term
15 policy issues that may require future consideration in the light of the
16 CHALLENGER accident.

17
18 In broad terms, the several tasks have been completed. Two essential ques-
19 tions have not been answered: how will the recommendations of the Presiden-
20 tial Commission on the causes of the CHALLENGER accident ("Rogers Commis-
21 sion") impinge upon the schedule and the cost of regaining operational status of
22 the Space Transportation System; and are there sound approaches for providing
23 the resources recommended for the reconstitution. The Interagency Group has
24 made assumptions on the effects of the Rogers Commission's recommendations
25 and has limited its work to the identification of the funding requirements asso-
26 ciated with the recommendations. In regard to the latter, the views of the Office
27 of Management and Budget are made part of the report.

28
29 Chapter II is a brief recapitulation of the background that undergirds the
30 discussion and in part contributes to the rationale used for developing the
31 recommendations.

32
33 Chapter III discusses the impacts on policy implementation and the means for
34 mitigating the impact on our immediate space launch capability prior to resump-
35 tion of operations and in the following period when the 3-orbiter STS fleet is
36 operational.

37
38
39
CONFIDENTIAL

Rev. K 03-14

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

01
02 Chapter IV is the discussion of the possible reconstitution strategies, under the
03 assumption that there is no change in the pre-accident requirements model
04 (except for schedule adjustment). This model reflects the U.S. space program as
05 included the President's 1987 budget submittal to Congress. The space launch
06 strategies, rationales, alternatives and the corresponding funding requirements
07 are presented.

08
09 Chapter V discusses the policy issues, in particular as regards the commercial
10 expendable launch vehicle industry and the longer-term future of the STS.
11 Chapter VI discusses two specific major areas of concern, only peripherally
12 addressed by the IG(Space) Working Group; namely the matter of timing with
13 respect to the Presidential Commission's report and the issue of budget
14 mechanisms whereby the remedial actions can be financed. In closing, Chapter
15 VI summarizes the findings and recommendations.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

CONFIDENTIAL

Rev. K 03-14

CONFIDENTIAL

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2014/02/20 : CIA-RDP92B00181R001701590031-4

OPTION DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

| CHARACTERISTICS | OPTION ONE Re-Establish the Status Quo | OPTION TWO No Orbiter Replacment and Procurement of Maximum Number of ELVs | OPTION THREE "Balanced Launcher Fleet" Replacement Orbiter by '90 Maximum ELV Buy | OPTION THREE A "Balanced Launcher Fleet" Replacement Orbiter by '92 Maximum ELV Buy |
|------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Shuttle / Orbiters | | | | |
| Replacement Buy | 1 | | | |
| LL Struct. Spares | yes | | | |
| Vandenberg LS | yes | | | |
| Flight Rates 87-88-89-90-91..95 | 6-14-18-20-..24 | | | |
| ELV Procurement | 10 CELVs | | | |
| Addl. Buy | 0 | | | |
| Procurement Rate | 0-2-2-2-2-2 | | | |
| ELV Launch Rate | TBD | | | |
| Backlog 87 through 93 | 20-25-31-35----- | | | |

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2014/02/20 : CIA-RDP92B00181R001701590031-4

CONFIDENTIAL

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2014/02/20 : CIA-RDP92B00181R001701590031-4

OPTION DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

| CHARACTERISTICS | OPTION ONE Re-Establish the Status Quo | OPTION TWO No Orbiter Replacement and Procurement of Maximum Number of ELVs | OPTION THREE "Balanced Launcher Fleet" Replacement Orbiter by '90 Maximum ELV Buy | OPTION THREE A "Balanced Launcher Fleet" Replacement Orbiter by '92 Maximum ELV Buy |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Shuttle / Orbiters | | | | |
| Replacement Buy | 1 | | | |
| LL Struct. Spares | yes | | | |
| Vandenberg LS | yes | | | |
| Flight Rates 87-88-89-90-91...95 | 6-14-18-20...24 | | | |
| ELV Procurement | 10 CELVs | | | |
| Addl. Buy | 0 | | | |
| Procurement Rate | 0-2-2-2-2-2 | | | |
| ELV Launch Rate | TBD | | | |
| Backlog 87 through 93 | 20-25-31-35----- | | | |

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2014/02/20 : CIA-RDP92B00181R001701590031-4